

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

9

### REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

While Applicants believe that all of the claims, as currently written, are patentable over the cited references, to speed prosecution, claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18-20, and 25 have been amended to define more clearly and particularly the features of the present invention.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

With respect to the prior art rejections, claims 1, 2, and 6-14 stand rejected on prior art grounds under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,664,163) in view of Peaslee, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,265,203).

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, and further in view of Baber, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,279,041).

Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, and in further view of Zhao, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,267).

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, and in further view of Deering (U.S. Patent No. 5,544,300).

Claims 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, and in further view of Epard, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,241,625).

Best Available Copy

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

10

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, in further view of Epard, and in further view of Nitta, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,619).

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

## **L THE CLAIMED INVENTION**

Applicants' invention, as disclosed and claimed, relates to a data transferring apparatus (and method) for transferring transfer packets each including one or more transfer data as objectives of transfer from a first apparatus to a second apparatus, wherein each transfer data includes commands indicating processes against a preliminarily assigned area.

In conventional devices, a raster interface is used to transfer image data, for example, from a computer to a display apparatus, which requires a large amount of data. However, when an ultra-high resolution display apparatus is used, there is a possibility that the data transferring capacity of the communication channel between the computer and the display apparatus will not be sufficient (e.g., see specification at page 1, lines 7-13).

The claimed invention, on the other hand, solves the problems associated with such an image data stream being transferred from a computer to an ultra high resolution display apparatus (e.g., see specification at page 1, lines 17-18, and page 2 lines 1-2).

For example, in an illustrative, non-limiting aspect of the invention as defined, for example, in independent claim 1, a data transferring apparatus for transferring transfer packets each including one or more transfer data as objectives of transfer from a first

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

11

apparatus to a second apparatus, the each transfer data including commands indicating processes against a preliminarily assigned area, includes a scheduler for merging a plurality of drawing commands meeting a certain requirement and for translating the merged drawing commands into a single drawing command, thereby reducing a volume of the transfer data, and a communication controller for generating transfer packets each including at least one of one or more the plurality of drawing commands whose amount is within a certain predetermined range and one or more the merged drawing commands. The communication controller transfers the generated transfer packets to the second apparatus.

Independent claim 2 recites somewhat similarly features as claim 1.

In other exemplary aspects of the invention as defined, for example, by independent claims 7 and 11, a method includes merging a plurality of drawing commands meeting a certain requirement and translating the merged drawing commands into a single drawing command, thereby reducing a volume of the transfer data, generating transfer packets each including at least one of one or more the plurality of drawing commands whose amount is within a certain predetermined range and one or more the merged drawing commands, and transferring the generated transfer packets to the second apparatus.

## II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants incorporate herein by reference in their entirety the traversal arguments set forth in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 filed on September 24, 2004 and the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed on March 14, 2005.

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

12

A. Claims 1, 2, and 6-14 stand rejected on prior art grounds under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee.

Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

**Independent claims 1, 2, 7, and 11**

The Examiner argues that it would be obvious to combine Yutaka and Peaslee to arrive at the claimed invention (see Office Action at page 3, lines 12-14).

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that it would not have been obvious to combine Yutaka and Peaslee to arrive at the claimed invention. Moreover, assuming *arguendo* that a reasonable motivation existed for making the alleged combination, Applicants submit that the resulting combination of Yutaka and Peaslee, either individually or in combination, would not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

In fact, in the present Office Action, the Examiner specifically agreed that "*the offset described in Yutaka ... has nothing to do with the amount of data volume that the present application is intended to reduce*" (see Office Action at page 2, lines 9-10; emphasis added).

Applicants submit that Peaslee also has nothing to do with reducing the amount of data volume.

Thus, Applicants submit that the amount of data volume clearly would not be reduced by any combination of Yutaka and Peaslee.

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

13

Moreover, it clearly would not be reasonable to combine Yutaka and Peaslee, which do not reduce the amount of data volume, to arrive at the claimed invention which reduces the amount of data volume, as recited for example, by independent claims 1 and 2.

For somewhat similar reasons as those set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 2, Applicants submit that Yutaka and Peaslee, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of novel and unobvious methods defined by claims 7 and 11.

**Dependent claims 6, 8-10, and 12-14**

Applicants submit that dependent claims 6, 8-10, and 12-14 also are patentable over the cited references by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 2, 7, and 11, as well as for the additional features defined therein.

For example, as exemplarily defined by dependent claims 8 and 9, the claimed invention uses an "offset" as a "reduction" in the amount of the data volume.

In comparison, Yutaka uses an "offset" as a "relative position" in a certain coordinate system.

Thus, Applicants submit that the Examiner has mischaracterized the features of Yutaka and the claimed invention. Thus, Yutaka clearly does not disclose or suggest the features of claims 8 and 9 for which it is relied upon.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Yutaka and Peaslee, either alone or in combination, clearly do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claims

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

14

6, 8-10, and 12-14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6, 8-10, and 12-14.

B. Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, and further in view of Baber. For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Baber is available as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), since Baber was filed on November 13, 1998 (prior to the present application's filing date of October 10, 2000) and issued as a U.S. Patent on August 21, 2001 (after the present application's filing date of October 10, 2000).

Also, Applicants submit that Baber is (and was at the time of the present invention) commonly assigned (recorded November 13, 1998, at Reel 009599; Frame 0967) to International Business Machines Corporation (IBM Corporation) as evidenced, for example, on the face of the U.S. Patent to Baber, et al. and the attached Patent Assignment of Abstract of Title for U.S. Patent No. 6,279,041B1 to Baber, et al. (which Applicants obtained from the U.S.P.T.O. Assignments on the Web).

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Baber is (and was at the time of the invention) commonly assigned to IBM Corporation and is available only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3). Therefore, Baber can be removed as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c).

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

15

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, and further in view of Baber should be withdrawn and that claims 3-5 should be passed to immediate allowance.

C. Claims 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, and in further view of Zhao.

The Examiner alleges that Zhao combines drawing instructions that affect a same area for a predetermined short period of time on a frame buffer (see Office Action at page 5, lines 4-5). Applicants respectfully disagree.

That is, Zhao does not make up for the deficiencies of Yutaka and Peaslee. For example, the actual combining operation of Zhao is completely different than the “merging” or “combining” of the claimed invention, as exemplarily defined by claims 15-17.

Zhao uses the address portion of commands to select a sort buffer, which stores commands for the same memory area in the order that the CPU originally wrote (e.g., see Zhao at column 2, lines 43-59). Because of this command sorting, Zhao can use a bus that combines multiple write operations to transfer data efficiently. Without using this command sorting, the write combine operation may change the order of data transfers that affect the same memory area, and hence, the write combine operation affects the consistency of the output from the graphics device (e.g., see Zhao at column 2, lines 21-40).

In comparison, in the claimed invention, the merging or combining operation is neither a sorting operation by the address nor a combining operation for efficient data

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

16

transfers. Instead, in the claimed invention, the first apparatus analyzes a sequence of graphics command and merges or changes them in such a way that that the amount of the data volume is reduced.

The claimed invention is capable of providing such novel and unobvious features, for example, because the first apparatus can have a command analysis routine (e.g., 340 in Figure 6) in the present application.

On the other hand, in Zhao, the first apparatus does not have such a device. Thus, Zhao can increase the data transfer efficiency through combining but actually does not reduce the amount of the data volume to be transferred between the two apparatuses.

In other words, Zhao clearly does not reduce the data volume, according to the claimed invention.

Moreover, as mentioned above, Yutaka and Peaslee also do not reduce the data volume.

Thus, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to combine Yutaka, Peaslee, and Zhao to arrive at the claimed invention. Further, even assuming *arguendo* that a reasonable motivation existed for combining these references in the manner alleged, Applicants submit that the resulting combination clearly would not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention, as defined by claims 15-17.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Zhao clearly does not make up for the acknowledged deficiencies of Yutaka and Peaslee. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 15-17 be withdrawn.



U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

17

D. Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, and in further view of Deering. For the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Deering provides a special frame buffer that accelerates rendering operations. In Deering, a pixel buffer (i.e., 56 in Figure 7) arguably employs dirty tags memory (i.e., 194 in Figure 7) to reduce the volume of the data to be written back to the DRAM memory (e.g., see Deering at column 19, lines 6-25). However, Deering clearly does not make up for the deficiencies of Yutaka and Peaslee for several reasons.

First, the pixel buffer (56) in Deering is a temporary buffer that holds a small subset of pixels in the frame memory for accelerating rendering operations. Thus, assuming *arguendo* that this pixel buffer would correspond to the first apparatus in the present application, the first apparatus would hold the entire frame buffer, which is essentially different from the pixel buffer in Deering.

For example, in Deering, the pixel buffer needs to read pixel data from the second apparatus (DRAM) in order to update the data.

In comparison, in the claimed invention, since the first apparatus includes the entire copy of the frame buffer, the first apparatus does not need to read pixel data from the second apparatus.

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

18

Thus, if the teachings of Deering were applied to the system configuration, for example, in the claimed invention, a bi-directional high speed link would be necessary between the two apparatuses.

In contrast, in the exemplary aspects of the claimed invention, a high speed link preferably is necessary only from the first apparatus to the second apparatus. On the other hand, the other connection from the second apparatus to the first apparatus can use a low-speed link.

Second, Deering uses memory write commands to update the frame memory. In contrast, the claimed invention uses graphical drawing commands.

Since graphical drawing commands provide a higher-level of abstractions than memory write commands, the claimed invention advantageously is capable of reducing the amount of the data volume further than Deering.

In other words, as mentioned above, in Deering, the first apparatus, the SRAM buffer (200, Figure 7) can hold a small subset of the second apparatus, the DRAM banks (Figure 4). Thus, if Deering were applied to arrive at the claimed invention, the first apparatus would need to obtain the pixel data from the second apparatus to update updated areas. This means that the alleged system configuration would need a bi-directional high speed communication channel.

Moreover, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to combine Yutaka, Peaslee, and Deering to arrive at the claimed invention, since Yutaka, Peaslee, and Deering,

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

19

either individually or in combination, do not reduce the amount of the data volume to be transferred between the two apparatuses.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Yutaka, Peaslee, and Deering, either individually or in combination, clearly do not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention, as alleged by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Additionally, while Applicants believe that claims 18-20 clearly are patentable over any combination of the cited references, to speed prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 18-20 to define more clearly and particularly the features of the claimed invention.

For example claims 18-20 recite, *inter alia*, that "said communication controller transfers only updated areas on a frame memory by analyzing graphics commands in a form of drawing commands to said second apparatus" (emphasis added).

Applicants submit that none of the cited references, in this rejection or otherwise, either individually or in combination, discloses or suggests these features of the claimed invention.

E. Claims 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, and in further view of Epard.

Epard discloses that two apparatuses are connected via a communication medium and that the two apparatuses have a drawing engine with a dedicated frame memory. In Epard, the source computer system translates graphics commands to another set of graphics

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

20

commands from which the destination computer can generate an identical image (e.g., see Epard at column 64, lines 59-68). This translation is done by a command-by-command basis (e.g., see Epard at column 64, lines 59-68).

This means that in Epard the first apparatus does not merge graphics commands to reduce the amount of the data volume that the first apparatus transmits to the second apparatus.

Thus, Epard clearly does not make up for the deficiencies of Yutaka and Peaslee, which also do not disclose or suggest reducing the amount of data volume.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to combine Yutaka, Peaslee, and Epard to arrive at the claimed invention.

Moreover, even assuming *arguendo* that it would have been obvious to combine these references, as alleged, Applicants respectfully submit that the alleged combination of Yutaka, Peaslee, and Epard would not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention, as defined by claims 21-24.

F. Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka in view of Peaslee, in further view of Epard, and in further view of Nitta.

First, Applicants submits that it would not have been obvious to combine Yutaka, Peaslee, Epard, and Nitta to arrive at the claimed invention.

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

21

For example, as mentioned above, the alleged combination of Yutaka, Peaslee, and Epard would not be capable of reducing the data/command traffic between the first apparatus and the second apparatus.

On the other hand, Nitta, which also does not disclose or suggest reducing the data/command traffic between the first apparatus and the second apparatus, does not make up for the deficiencies of Yutaka, Peaslee, and Epard.

Second, even assuming *arguendo* that a reasonable motivation existed for combining the references in the manner alleged by the Examiner, Applicants submit that the alleged combination of Yutaka, Peaslee, Epard, and Nitta, either individually or in combination, would not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

For example, contrary to the Examiner's position (see Office Action at pages 7-8, bridging paragraph), Nitta does not describe an apparatus that merges and holds certain graphics commands in the apparatus until the communication link becomes ready.

Instead, in Nitta, the first apparatus includes a hold signal generating circuit (122 in Figure 2), which includes a comparator (COMP in Figure 2). The comparator compares the input data (DA1 in Figure 2) with the one in the last clock cycle (DA2 in Figure 2). The hold signal becomes high one cycle after DA1 and DA2 becomes the same (CYCLE 4 and 8 in Figure 3).

Thus, the hold signal merely indicates that the transmitter is sending the same data continuously. Indeed, the device of Nitta has nothing to do with merging graphics commands, according to the claimed invention.

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

22

In other words, Nitta only generates a hold signal when a pixel data is the same as the one in the last clock cycle. Nitta introduces a one-clock delay in the pixel data by using a latch (LAT1 in Figure 2) to generate the hold signal but the delay has nothing to do with generating identical images at the two apparatuses.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Yutaka, Peaslee, Epard, and Nitta, either individually or in combination, would not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

While Applicants believe that claim 25 is patentable over the alleged combination of references, to speed prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 25 to define more clearly and particularly that "*said first drawing engine and said second drawing engine generate identical images including a different timing due to due to at least one communication error from said first apparatus to said second apparatus*" (emphasis added), as exemplarily illustrated in Figure 16 and exemplarily described in the corresponding disclosure.

Applicants submit that Yutaka, Peaslee, Epard, and Nitta, either individually or in combination, clearly do not disclose or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to combine Yutaka, Peaslee, Epard, and Nitta to arrive at the claimed invention.

Moreover, Applicants submit that, even assuming *arguendo* that a reasonable motivation existed for making the alleged combination, Yutaka, Peaslee, Epard, and Nitta, either individually or in combination, still would not disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

U.S. Serial No. 09/684,328  
Attorney Docket No. JA919990169US1  
(YOR.235)

23

### III. CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-25, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Assignee's Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully Submitted,


Date: July 11, 2005

  
John J. Dresch, Esq.  
Registration No. 46,672  
Sean M. McGinn  
Registration No. 34,386

**McGinn & Gibb, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
Customer No. 21254

### CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I certify that I transmitted via facsimile to (703) 872-9306 the enclosed Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 to Examiner Joni Hsu, Art Unit 2676, on July 11, 2005.

  
John J. Dresch, Esq.  
Registration No. 46,672  
Sean M. McGinn, Esq.  
Registration No. 34,386

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**